

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the following remarks.

Obviousness Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

To reject a claim or claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. M.P.E.P. § 2142. When establishing a prima facie case of obviousness, the Examiner must set forth evidence showing that the following three criteria are satisfied:

First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or to combine teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. M.P.E.P. § 2143.

The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on the applicant's disclosure. M.P.E.P. § 2142 (citing *In re Vaeck*, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)). Also, the evidentiary showing of a motivation or suggestion to combine prior art references "must be clear and particular." *In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 999, 50 U.S.P.Q.2d 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent 6,772,189 to Asselin in View of U.S. Patent 6,470,397 to Shah et al.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10-16, 18-21, 24-27, and 29-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,772,189 to Asselin (hereinafter “Asselin”) in view of U.S. Patent 6,470,397 to Shah et al. (hereinafter “Shah”). Claims 2, 5, 8, 10-14, 16, 21, 24, 27, 29, 30, 32-33, and 35 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection with regard to the remaining claims, as set forth below.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A computer implemented method comprising:
requesting a first deferred procedure call for a first interrupt event associated with a source;
requesting at least one other different deferred procedure call for a second interrupt event associated with the source, wherein the first interrupt event comprises one type of event and the second interrupt event comprises another type of event;
assigning the first deferred procedure call to **a first thread of a processor supporting a number of threads of execution;**
assigning the second deferred procedure call to **a second thread of the number of threads of execution;** and
concurrently processing the first interrupt event on the first thread and the second interrupt event on the second thread.

Each of independent claims 15 and 20, as amended, recites some limitations similar to those recited in claim 1.

The cited prior art, either individually or in combination, do not disclose the assignment of a first deferred procedure call to a first thread of a processor having multiple execution threads and the assignment of a second deferred procedure call to a

second thread of the processor, as well as the concurrent execution of these deferred procedure calls to process two different types of interrupt events. Regarding Galloway (U.S. Patent 6,378,004), it is noted that the referenced text at column 3, lines 11-33 simply describes a multitasking operating system that support multiple threads of execution within a running process, whereas the referenced text at column 13, line 52 to column 14, line 9 says nothing more than the use of a deferred procedure call to set an event object. Galloway (alone or in combination with Asselin and/or Shah) does not disclose the claimed embodiment.

As Asselin and Shah, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose at least the above-noted limitations of independent claims 1, 15, and 20, each of these claims is nonobvious in view of these references. Also, if an independent claim is nonobvious, then any claim depending from the independent claim is also nonobvious. M.P.E.P. §2143.03 (citing *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). Therefore, claims 6, 7, and 31 are allowable as depending from nonobvious independent claim 1, claims 18 and 19 are allowable as depending from nonobvious independent claim 15, and claims 25, 26, and 34 are allowable as depending from nonobvious independent claim 20.

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent 6,772,189 to Asselin in View of U.S. Patent 6,470,397 to Shah et al. and Further in View of U.S. Patent 6,378,004 to Galloway et al.

Claims 3, 4, 9, 17, 22, 23, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asselin in view of Shah and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,378,004 to Galloway (hereinafter “Galloway”). Applicants note that each of claims 3, 4, 9, 17, 22, 23, and 28 have been canceled.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that claims 1, 6-7, 15, 18-20, 25-26, 31, and 34 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests allowance of such claims.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.


Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 28, 2006

/Kerry D. Tweet/
Kerry D. Tweet, Reg. No. 45,959

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(503) 684-6200

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail on the below date with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Signature: 

Theresa Belland

04/28/06

Date